

REMARKS

The application is being abandoned for reasons unrelated to patentability. In particular, applicant does not concede that any of the claims have been properly rejected under 35 USC §103.

First, it is significant to distinguish between light sensitive technologies. The present invention relates to lithographic printing plates where the imaged surface has areas that are soluble in the developer and areas that are insoluble in the developer. In contrast, photographic films utilize an imaged surface where there are areas that are reactive in the developer and areas that are non-reactive in the developer. When a silver halide light sensitive film is imaged, the incident radiation causes free silver to form in light-struck areas. The developing process is an oxidation-reduction process, with the free silver serving as a nucleating site for the continued reduction of silver to produce an image. Development is a chemical change and not a dissolution process. Both systems may be described as "light sensitive" sheets, but they are very different.

The Manico '146 reference is directed at light sensitive film or paper (including webs of such material), and is disclosed to have particular utility in the printing of images for photographs. There is no disclosure of lithographic plates. There is no disclosure of metal sheets or webs. Since the primary substrate for lithographic printing plates is aluminum, and this was true and well known at the time of the Manico patent, it is incorrect to infer that the Manico invention is applicable to the processing of lithographic printing plates.


The Szajewski '398 reference is also an apparatus for photographic material processing. What is very significant is that in Figure 3 and in the text of column 4, lines 24-44, Szajewski uses a wire bar as a spreader, and teaches that the developer film has an uneven distribution. Thus their developer is not self leveling. Therefore it is not proper to infer that the Manico developer, also directed at photographic printing, is self leveling.

The rejection under 35 USC 101 is not based on prior art and could have easily been overcome in a variety of ways. This issue should be deemed moot, rather than conceded.

Accordingly, no inferences should be drawn that applicant acquiesced in any of the rejections or the reasoning advanced by the examiner

Respectfully submitted,

Howard A. FROMSON
and William J. ROZELL



L. James Ristas
Registration No. 28,663
Alix, Yale & Ristas, LLP
Attorney for Applicant

Date: April 11, 2005
750 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06103-2721
Our Ref: FRO/188/US
LJR/ds

G:\AYR saved docs\Filing Docs\Fro\fro188us\fro188us 04-11-05 abandonment.doc